

***REMARKS***

The Examiner is thanked for the thorough examination of the present application. This is a full and timely response to that outstanding Office Action mailed October 16, 2009. Upon entry of the amendments in this response, claims 1, 3-20, and 22-35 remain pending. More specifically, claims 1, 3, 9, 12, 16, 17, 29, and 34 are amended. Claim 2 is canceled without prejudice, waiver, or disclaimer. No new matter is added to the present application by these amendments.

**I. Claim Objections**

The Office Action objects to claim 1 because of an informality. Claim 1 has been amended to address the Examiner's concerns. Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the objection.

**II. Telephone Interview**

The Examiner is encouraged to contact Applicant's attorney, after reviewing the present response, to resolve or discuss any questions or outstanding issues in an effort to expedite examination of the present application.

**III. Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)**

The Office Action rejects claims 1-3, 6-10, 12, 14, 16-19, 23-25, 27, 29, 32, and 34 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over O'Neal (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2006/0171514) in view of Applicant's Admitted Prior Art (AAPA) in further view of *Holmes* (U.S. Patent No. 6,178,331) in further view of *Spearman* (U.S.

Patent No. 7,035,281) in further view of *Troen-Krasnow* (U.S. Patent No. 6,442,250). The Office Action rejects claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over *O'Neal* in view of AAPA in further view of *Holmes* in further view of *Spearman* in further view of *Troen-Krasnow* in further view of *Chuah* (U.S. Patent No. 6,400,722). The Office Action rejects claim 5 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over *O'Neal* in view of AAPA in further view of *Holmes* in further view of *Spearman* in further view of *Troen-Krasnow* in further view of *Kozdon* (U.S. Patent No. 6,456,601). The Office Action rejects claim 11 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over *O'Neal* in view of AAPA in further view of *Holmes* in further view of *Spearman* in further view of *Troen-Krasnow* in further view of *Rogers* (U.S. Patent No. 6,301,484). The Office Action rejects claims 13, 20, and 22 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over *O'Neal* in view of AAPA in further view of *Holmes* in further view of *Spearman* in further view of *Troen-Krasnow* in further view of *Bookspan* (U.S. Patent No. 6,636,888). The Office Action rejects claim 15, 26, and 30 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over *O'Neal* in view of AAPA in further view of *Holmes* in further view of *Spearman* in further view of *Troen-Krasnow* in further view of *Lewis* (U.S. Patent No. 6,513,019). The Office Action rejects claims 28 and 31 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over *O'Neal* in view of AAPA in further view of *Holmes* in further view of *Spearman* in further view of *Troen-Krasnow* in further view of *Ooe* (U.S. Patent No. 6,330,238). The Office Action rejects claims 33 and 35 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over *O'Neal* in view of AAPA in further view of *Holmes* in further view of *Spearman* in further view of *Troen-Krasnow* in further view of *Lewis* in further view of *Bookspan*.

A. Claims 1-3, 6-10, 12, and 14

Independent claim 1 recites:

A method for sending electronic mail from a client operating within a client-server architecture, the method comprising:

(a) provisioning the client with client broadcast text messaging software;

(b) provisioning a server with server broadcast text messaging software, wherein the server is in communication with the client;

(c) *broadcasting from the client a text message in a broadcast transmission in a format of the broadcast text messaging software using subject based addressing wherein text in a subject field of the text message indicates an intended recipient, and wherein the text message contains electronic mail parameters including a destination email address for the electronic mail in a body of the text message;*

(d) *receiving the text message at the server after discerning from the text in the subject field that the text message is intended for the server;*

(e) *reformatting the text message from the format of the broadcast text messaging software to a format compatible with an email server; and*

(f) *forwarding the reformatted text message to the email server in an email transmission to the destination email address;*

*wherein broadcasting includes transmitting a text message from a single network component to all components on a network.*

(Emphasis added).

Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 1 is allowable for at least the reason that the combination of O'Neal in view of AAPA in further view of Holmes in further view of Spearman in further view of Troen-Krasnow does not disclose, teach, or suggest at least "(c) broadcasting from the client a text message in a broadcast transmission in a format of the broadcast text messaging software using subject

based addressing wherein text in a subject field of the text message indicates an intended recipient, and wherein the text message contains electronic mail parameters including a destination email address for the electronic mail in a body of the text message; (d) receiving the text message at the server after discerning from the text in the subject field that the text message is intended for the server; (e) reformatting the text message from the format of the broadcast text messaging software to a format compatible with an email server, wherein the reformatted text message is addressed to the destination email address obtained from the body of the text message; and (f) forwarding the reformatted text message to the email server in an email transmission to the destination email address, wherein broadcasting includes transmitting a text message from a single network component to all components on a network, " as emphasized above.

For example, *O'Neal* discloses a message router which translates a message addressed to multiple recipients to multiple individual messages each addressed to an individual recipient. See abstract and summary. In *O'Neal*, a message is "broadcasted" only to addresses contained in the message and not to all components on a network. Further, in *O'Neal*, a recipient of a text message is not disclosed to receive the text message after discerning from a subject of the text message that the message is intended for the recipient. Also, *O'Neal* fails to address a server receiving a text message, reformatting the text message into an email format, and forwarding the message onto an email server.

For at least these reasons, *O'Neal* fails to teach or suggest at least "(c) broadcasting from the client a text message in a broadcast transmission in a format of the broadcast text messaging software using subject based addressing wherein text in a subject field of the text message indicates an intended recipient, and wherein the text message contains electronic mail parameters including a destination email address for the electronic mail in a body of the text message; (d) receiving the text message at the server after discerning from the text in the subject field that the text message is intended for the server; (e) reformatting the text message from the format of the broadcast text messaging software to a format compatible with an email server, wherein the reformatted text message is addressed to the destination email address obtained from the body of the text message; and (f) forwarding the reformatted text message to the email server in an email transmission to the destination email address, **wherein broadcasting includes transmitting a text message from a single network component to all components on a network**," as recited in claim 1.

Further, *Holmes* describes matching an address of a sender with an alias of the sender associated with a reply. As such, *Holmes* does not remedy the deficiencies of *O'Neal*. Also, *Spearman* describes a wireless provisioning device capable of routing TCP/IP traffic. Likewise, *Spearman* does not remedy the deficiencies of *O'Neal* and *Holmes*.

In addition, *Troen-Krasnow* discloses transmission of a message to recipients identified within a group. Accordingly, in *Troen-Krasnow*, a message is "broadcasted" only to addresses identified within a predefined group and not to all

components on a network. For example, *Troen-Krasnow* states that “a message broadcast unit, consistent with the present invention, provides a subscriber with the ability to effectively and immediately broadcast a single message to a group of individuals, or message recipients.” Col. 3, lines 51-55. Accordingly, *Troen-Krasnow* does not remedy the deficiencies of *O’Neal*, *Holmes*, and *Spearman*. For that matter, the background section of Applicant’s disclosure also does not remedy the aforementioned deficiencies.

As a result, *O’Neal* in view of AAPA in further view of *Holmes* in further view of *Spearman* in further view of *Troen-Krasnow* fails to teach or suggest at least “(c) broadcasting from the client a text message in a broadcast transmission in a format of the broadcast text messaging software using subject based addressing wherein text in a subject field of the text message indicates an intended recipient, and wherein the text message contains electronic mail parameters including a destination email address for the electronic mail in a body of the text message; (d) receiving the text message at the server after discerning from the text in the subject field that the text message is intended for the server; (e) reformatting the text message from the format of the broadcast text messaging software to a format compatible with an email server, wherein the reformatted text message is addressed to the destination email address obtained from the body of the text message; and (f) forwarding the reformatted text message to the email server in an email transmission to the destination email address, wherein broadcasting includes transmitting a text message from a single network component to all components on a network,” as recited in claim 1. Therefore, the rejection of claim 1

should be withdrawn. Since claims 3, 6-10, 12, and 14 depend from claim 1 and recite additional features, claims 3, 6-10, 12, and 14 are also allowable over the cited art.

Claim 2 is canceled without prejudice, waiver, or disclaimer, and therefore, the rejection to the claim is rendered moot. Applicant takes this action merely to reduce the number of disputed issues and to facilitate early allowance and issuance of other claims in the present application. Applicant reserves the right to pursue the subject matter of the canceled claim in a continuing application, if Applicant so chooses, and does not intend to dedicate any of the canceled subject matter to the public.

B. Claims 4, 5, 11, 13, and 15

Applicant respectfully submits that *Chuah* does not make up for the deficiencies of *O'Neal* in view of *AAPA* in further view of *Holmes* in further view of *Spearman* in further view of *Troen-Krasnow* in disclosing all of the features of independent claim 1; *Kozdon* does not make up for the deficiencies of *O'Neal* in view of *AAPA* in further view of *Holmes* in further view of *Spearman* in further view of *Troen-Krasnow* in disclosing all of the features of independent claim 1; *Rogers* does not make up for the deficiencies of *O'Neal* in view of *AAPA* in further view of *Holmes* in further view of *Spearman* in further view of *Troen-Krasnow* in disclosing all of the features of independent claim 1; *Bookspan* does not make up for the deficiencies of *O'Neal* in view of *AAPA* in further view of *Holmes* in further view of *Spearman* in further view of *Troen-Krasnow* in disclosing all of the features of independent claim 1; and *Lewis* does not make up for the deficiencies of *O'Neal* in view of *AAPA* in further view of *Holmes* in further view of *Spearman* in further view of *Troen-Krasnow* in disclosing all of the features of

independent claim 1. Therefore, claims 4, 5, 11, 13, and 15 are considered patentable over any combination of the cited art for at least the reason that claims 4, 5, 11, 13, and 15 incorporate allowable features of claim 1 as set forth above.

C. Claims 16-19, 23-25, and 27

Independent claim 16 recites:

A system for sending an electronic mail (email) from a client in a client-server architecture, the system comprising:

(a) a plurality of clients, wherein each client of the plurality of clients contains client broadcast text messaging software, data processing software, and a client application program interface, and wherein each client is in communication with the plurality of clients;

(b) *a text messaging server in communication with the plurality of clients, wherein the text messaging server contains server broadcast text messaging software and an email application program interface, wherein the email application program interface is adapted to receive a text message containing parameters of the electronic mail using subject based addressing in a broadcast transmission wherein text in a subject field of the text message indicates an intended recipient and a destination email address is contained in a body of the text message, wherein the text messaging server discerns from the text in the subject field that the text message is intended for the text messaging server, and reformat the text message from a format compatible with the server broadcast text messaging software to a format compatible with an email server addressed to the destination email address;* and

(c) an email server in communication with the text messaging server;

*wherein the broadcast text messaging software is configured to transmit a text message from a single network component to all components on a network.*

(Emphasis added).

Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 16 is allowable for at least the reason that the combination of O'Neal in view of AAPA in further view of Holmes in further view of Spearman in further view of Troen-Krasnow does not disclose, teach, or

suggest at least “(b) a text messaging server in communication with the plurality of clients, wherein the text messaging server contains server broadcast text messaging software and an email application program interface, wherein the email application program interface is adapted to receive a text message containing parameters of the electronic mail using subject based addressing in a broadcast transmission wherein text in a subject field of the text message indicates an intended recipient and a destination email address is contained in a body of the text message, wherein the text messaging server discerns from the text in the subject field that the text message is intended for the text messaging server, and reformats the text message from a format compatible with the server broadcast text messaging software to a format compatible with an email server addressed to the destination email address . . . wherein the broadcast text messaging software is configured to transmit a text message from a single network component to all components on a network,” as emphasized above.

For example, *O’Neal* discloses a message router which translates a message addressed to multiple recipients to multiple individual messages each addressed to an individual recipient. See abstract and summary. In *O’Neal*, a message is “broadcasted” only to addresses contained in the message and not to all components on a network. Further, in *O’Neal*, a recipient of a text message is not disclosed to receive the text message after discerning from a subject of the text message that the message is intended for the recipient. For at least these reasons, *O’Neal* fails to teach or suggest at least “(b) a text messaging server in communication with the plurality of clients, wherein the text messaging server contains

server broadcast text messaging software and an email application program interface, wherein the email application program interface is adapted to receive a text message containing parameters of the electronic mail using subject based addressing in a broadcast transmission wherein text in a subject field of the text message indicates an intended recipient and a destination email address is contained in a body of the text message, wherein the text messaging server discerns from the text in the subject field that the text message is intended for the text messaging server, and reformats the text message from a format compatible with the server broadcast text messaging software to a format compatible with an email server addressed to the destination email address . . . wherein the broadcast text messaging software is configured to transmit a text message from a single network component to all components on a network," as recited in claim 16.

Further, *Holmes* describes matching an address of a sender with an alias of the sender. As such, *Holmes* does not remedy the deficiencies of *O'Neal*. Also, *Spearman* describes a wireless provisioning device capable of routing TCP/IP traffic. Likewise, *Spearman* does not remedy the deficiencies of *O'Neal* and *Holmes*.

In addition, *Troen-Krasnow* discloses transmission of a message to recipients identified within a group. Accordingly, in *Troen-Krasnow*, a message is "broadcasted" only to addresses identified within a predefined group and not to all components on a network. For example, *Troen-Krasnow* states that "a message broadcast unit, consistent with the present invention, provides a subscriber with the ability to effectively and immediately broadcast a single message to a group of

individuals, or message recipients.” Col. 3, lines 51-55. Accordingly, *Troen-Krasnow* does not remedy the deficiencies of *O’Neal*, *Holmes*, and *Spearman*. For that matter, the background section of Applicant’s disclosure also does not remedy the aforementioned deficiencies.

As a result, *O’Neal* in view of AAPA in further view of *Holmes* in further view of *Spearman* in further view of *Troen-Krasnow* fails to teach or suggest at least “(b) a text messaging server in communication with the plurality of clients, wherein the text messaging server contains server broadcast text messaging software and an email application program interface, wherein the email application program interface is adapted to receive a text message containing parameters of the electronic mail using subject based addressing in a broadcast transmission wherein text in a subject field of the text message indicates an intended recipient and a destination email address is contained in a body of the text message, wherein the text messaging server discerns from the text in the subject field that the text message is intended for the text messaging server, and reformats the text message from a format compatible with the server broadcast text messaging software to a format compatible with an email server addressed to the destination email address . . . wherein the broadcast text messaging software is configured to transmit a text message from a single network component to all components on a network,” as recited in claim 16. Therefore, the rejection of claim 16 should be withdrawn. Since claims 16-19, 23-25, and 27 depend from claim 16 and recite additional features, claims 16-19, 23-25, and 27 are also allowable over the cited art.

D. Claims 13, 15, 20, 22, 26, and 28

Applicant respectfully submits that *Bookspan* does not make up for the deficiencies of *O'Neal* in view of AAPA in further view of *Holmes* in further view of *Spearman* in further view of *Troen-Krasnow* in disclosing all of the features of independent claim 16; *Lewis* does not make up for the deficiencies of *O'Neal* in view of AAPA in further view of *Holmes* in further view of *Spearman* in further view of *Troen-Krasnow* in disclosing all of the features of independent claim 16; and *Ooe* does not make up for the deficiencies of *O'Neal* in view of AAPA in further view of *Holmes* in further view of *Spearman* in further view of *Troen-Krasnow* in disclosing all of the features of independent claim 16. Therefore, claims 13, 15, 20, 22, 26, and 28 are considered patentable over any combination of the cited art for at least the reason that claims 13, 15, 20, 22, 26, and 28 incorporate allowable features of claim 16 as set forth above.

E. Claims 29 and 32

Independent claim 29 recites:

A method for sending an electronic mail (email) comprising:

(a) *broadcasting from a client computer a text message in a broadcast format using subject based addressing wherein text in a subject field of the text message, and wherein a body of the text message contains a destination email address, email subject, and email body for the electronic email, wherein the client computer is part of a client-server architecture;*

(b) *receiving the text message at a server computer of the client-server architecture after discerning from the text in the subject field that the text message is intended for the server computer;*

**(c) reformatting the text message from the broadcast format to an email format having the destination email address, the email subject, and the email body from the text message; and**

**(d) forwarding the reformatted text message to an email server that is compatible with the email format; wherein broadcasting includes transmitting a text message from a single component on a network.**

(Emphasis added).

Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 29 is allowable for at least the reason that the combination of O'Neal in view of AAPA in further view of *Holmes* in further view of *Spearman* in further view of *Troen-Krasnow* does not disclose, teach, or suggest at least "(a) broadcasting from a client computer a text message in a broadcast format using subject based addressing wherein text in a subject field of the text message, and wherein a body of the text message contains a destination email address, email subject, and email body for the electronic email, wherein the client computer is part of a client-server architecture; (b) receiving the text message at a server computer of the client-server architecture after discerning from the text in the subject field that the text message is intended for the server computer; (c) reformatting the text message from the broadcast format to an email format having the destination email address, the email subject, and the email body from the text message; and (d) forwarding the reformatted text message to an email server that is compatible with the email format, wherein broadcasting includes transmitting a text message from a single component on a network," as emphasized above.

For example, *O'Neal* discloses a message router which translates a message addressed to multiple recipients to multiple individual messages each addressed to an individual recipient. See abstract and summary. In *O'Neal*, a message is “broadcasted” only to addresses contained in the message and not to all components on a network. Further, in *O'Neal*, a recipient of a text message is not disclosed to receive the text message after discerning from a subject of the text message that the message is intended for the recipient. Also, *O'Neal* fails to address a server computer receiving a text message, reformatting the text message into an email format, and forwarding the message onto an email server.

For at least these reasons, *O'Neal* fails to teach or suggest at least “(a) broadcasting from a client computer a text message in a broadcast format using subject based addressing wherein text in a subject field of the text message, and wherein a body of the text message contains a destination email address, email subject, and email body for the electronic email, wherein the client computer is part of a client-server architecture; (b) receiving the text message at a server computer of the client-server architecture after discerning from the text in the subject field that the text message is intended for the server computer; (c) reformatting the text message from the broadcast format to an email format having the destination email address, the email subject, and the email body from the text message; and (d) forwarding the reformatted text message to an email server that is compatible with the email format, wherein broadcasting includes transmitting a text message from a single component on a network,” as recited in claim 29.

Further, *Holmes* describes matching an address of a sender with an alias of the sender. As such, *Holmes* does not remedy the deficiencies of *O'Neal*. Also, *Spearman* describes a wireless provisioning device capable of routing TCP/IP traffic. Likewise, *Spearman* does not remedy the deficiencies of *O'Neal* and *Holmes*.

In addition, *Troen-Krasnow* discloses transmission of a message to recipients identified within a group. Accordingly, in *Troen-Krasnow*, a message is “broadcasted” only to addresses identified within a predefined group and not to all components on a network. For example, *Troen-Krasnow* states that “a message broadcast unit, consistent with the present invention, provides a subscriber with the ability to effectively and immediately broadcast a single message to a group of individuals, or message recipients.” Col. 3, lines 51-55. Accordingly, *Troen-Krasnow* does not remedy the deficiencies of *O'Neal*, *Holmes*, and *Spearman*. For that matter, the background section of Applicant's disclosure also does not remedy the aforementioned deficiencies.

As a result, *O'Neal* in view of AAPA in further view of *Holmes* in further view of *Spearman* in further view of *Troen-Krasnow* fails to teach or suggest at least “(a) broadcasting from a client computer a text message in a broadcast format using subject based addressing wherein text in a subject field of the text message, and wherein a body of the text message contains a destination email address, email subject, and email body for the electronic email, wherein the client computer is part of a client-server architecture; (b) receiving the text message at a server computer of the client-server architecture after discerning from the text in the

subject field that the text message is intended for the server computer; (c) reformatting the text message from the broadcast format to an email format having the destination email address, the email subject, and the email body from the text message; and (d) forwarding the reformatted text message to an email server that is compatible with the email format, wherein broadcasting includes transmitting a text message from a single component on a network," as recited in claim 29. Therefore, the rejection of claim 29 should be withdrawn. Since claim 32 depends from claim 29 and recites additional features, claim 32 is also allowable over the cited art.

F. Claims 30-31 and 33

Applicant respectfully submits that *Lewis* does not make up for the deficiencies of *O'Neal* in view of *AAPA* in further view of *Holmes* in further view of *Spearman* in further view of *Troen-Krasnow* in disclosing all of the features of independent claim 29; *Ooe* does not make up for the deficiencies of *O'Neal* in view of *AAPA* in further view of *Holmes* in further view of *Spearman* in further view of *Troen-Krasnow* in disclosing all of the features of independent claim 29; and *Lewis* and *Bookspan* do not make up for the deficiencies of *O'Neal* in view of *AAPA* in further view of *Holmes* in further view of *Spearman* in further view of *Troen-Krasnow* in disclosing all of the features of independent claim 29.

Therefore, claims 30-31 and 33 are considered patentable over any combination of the cited art for at least the reason that claims 30-31 and 33 incorporate allowable features of claim 29 as set forth above.

G. Claim 34

Independent claim 34 recites:

A system for sending an electronic mail from a client in a client-server architecture, the system comprising:

(a) ***means for broadcasting from a client computer a text message in a broadcast format using subject based addressing wherein text in a subject field of the text message, and wherein a body of the text message contains a destination email address, email subject, and email body for the electronic email, wherein the client computer is part of a client-server architecture;***

(b) ***means for receiving the text message at a server computer of the client-server architecture after discerning from the text in the subject field that the text message is intended for the server computer;***

(c) ***means for reformatting the text message from the broadcast format to an email format having the destination email address, the email subject, and the email body from the text message; and***

(d) ***means for forwarding the reformatted text message to an email server that is compatible with the email format;***

***wherein broadcasting includes transmitting a text message from a single network component to all components on a network.***

(Emphasis added).

Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 34 is allowable for at least the reason that the combination of O’Neal in view of AAPA in further view of Holmes in further view of Spearman in further view of Troen-Krasnow does not disclose, teach, or suggest at least “(a) means for broadcasting from a client computer a text message in a broadcast format using subject based addressing wherein text in a subject field of the text message, and wherein a body of the text message contains a destination email address, email subject, and email body for the electronic email, wherein the client computer is part of a client-server architecture; (b) means for receiving the text message at a server computer of the client-server architecture after discerning

from the text in the subject field that the text message is intended for the server computer; (c) means for reformatting the text message from the broadcast format to an email format having the destination email address, the email subject, and the email body from the text message; and (d) means for forwarding the reformatted text message to an email server that is compatible with the email format, wherein broadcasting includes transmitting a text message from a single network component to all components on a network," as emphasized above.

For example, *O'Neal* discloses a message router which translates a message addressed to multiple recipients to multiple individual messages each addressed to an individual recipient. See abstract and summary. In *O'Neal*, a message is "broadcasted" only to addresses contained in the message and not to all components on a network.

For at least these reasons, *O'Neal* fails to teach or suggest at least "(a) means for broadcasting from a client computer a text message in a broadcast format using subject based addressing wherein text in a subject field of the text message, and wherein a body of the text message contains a destination email address, email subject, and email body for the electronic email, wherein the client computer is part of a client-server architecture; (b) means for receiving the text message at a server computer of the client-server architecture after discerning from the text in the subject field that the text message is intended for the server computer; (c) means for reformatting the text message from the broadcast format to an email format having the destination email address, the email subject, and the email body from the text message; and (d) means for forwarding the

reformatted text message to an email server that is compatible with the email format, wherein broadcasting includes transmitting a text message from a single network component to all components on a network,” as recited in claim34.

Further, *Holmes* describes matching an address of a sender with an alias of the sender. As such, *Holmes* does not remedy the deficiencies of *O’Neal*. Also, *Spearman* describes a wireless provisioning device capable of routing TCP/IP traffic. Likewise, *Spearman* does not remedy the deficiencies of *O’Neal* and *Holmes*.

In addition, *Troen-Krasnow* discloses transmission of a message to recipients identified within a group. Accordingly, in *Troen-Krasnow*, a message is “broadcasted” only to addresses identified within a predefined group and not to all components on a network. For example, *Troen-Krasnow* states that “a message broadcast unit, consistent with the present invention, provides a subscriber with the ability to effectively and immediately broadcast a single message to a group of individuals, or message recipients.” Col. 3, lines 51-55. Accordingly, *Troen-Krasnow* does not remedy the deficiencies of *O’Neal*, *Holmes*, and *Spearman*. For that matter, the background section of Applicant’s disclosure also does not remedy the aforementioned deficiencies.

As a result, *O’Neal* in view of AAPA in further view of *Holmes* in further view of *Spearman* in further view of *Troen-Krasnow* fails to teach or suggest at least “(a) means for broadcasting from a client computer a text message in a broadcast format using subject based addressing wherein text in a subject field of the text message, and wherein a body of the text message contains a destination email

address, email subject, and email body for the electronic email, wherein the client computer is part of a client-server architecture; (b) means for receiving the text message at a server computer of the client-server architecture after discerning from the text in the subject field that the text message is intended for the server computer; (c) means for reformatting the text message from the broadcast format to an email format having the destination email address, the email subject, and the email body from the text message; and (d) means for forwarding the reformatted text message to an email server that is compatible with the email format, wherein broadcasting includes transmitting a text message from a single network component to all components on a network," as recited in claim 34. Therefore, the rejection of claim 34 should be withdrawn.

#### H. Claim 35

Applicant respectfully submits that *Lewis* and *Bookspan* do not make up for the deficiencies of *O'Neal* in view of *AAPA* in further view of *Holmes* in further view of *Spearman* in further view of *Troen-Krasnow* in disclosing all of the features of independent claim 34. Therefore, claim 35 is considered patentable over any combination of the cited art for at least the reason that claim 35 incorporates allowable features of claim 34 as set forth above.

**CONCLUSION**

For at least the reasons set forth above, all objections and/or rejections have been traversed, rendered moot, and/or addressed, and that the now pending claims are in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the present application and all pending claims are hereby courteously requested.

Any other statements in the Office Action that are not explicitly addressed herein are not intended to be admitted. In addition, any and all findings of inherency are traversed as not having been shown to be necessarily present. Furthermore, any and all findings of well-known art and Official Notice, or statements interpreted similarly, should not be considered well-known for the particular and specific reasons that the claimed combinations are too complex to support such conclusions and because the Office Action does not include specific findings predicated on sound technical and scientific reasoning to support such conclusions.

If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephonic conference would expedite the examination of this matter, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at (770) 933-9500.

Respectfully submitted,

/Charles W. Griggers/  
**Charles W. Griggers, Reg. No. 47,283**